

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending, with claim 20 added by this paper.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 2 stands rejected as allegedly being indefinite. Although applicants do not necessarily acquiesce to this ground of rejection, applicants have inserted the term --further-- before "comprised" to remove this ground of rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that inserting the term --further-- does not narrow the scope of the claim.

Allowable Subject Matter and Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicants acknowledge that claims 4 and 14-19 stand objected upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form to include all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have rewritten claims 4, 14, and 17, to include, respectively, the substantive features of claims 4 and 1, claims 14 and 1, and claims 17 and 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference U.S. Patent No. 5,595,955 (Chang) fails to teach or suggest a backcoating incorporating an optically variable compound selected from the group consisting of NIRF compounds, fluorescent compounds, or photochromic compounds. Consequently, applicants respectfully submit that claims 4, 14 and 17 are allowable. Similarly, applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is also patentable for at least substantially the same reasons. In addition, applicants have amended claim 16 to depend from claim 14, and claim 19 to depend from claim 17.

Moreover, Chang fails to teach or suggest a backcoating having a visible image printed thereon (relevant to new claim 20). Consequently, applicants respectfully submit that this claim, and claims depending therefrom, are patentable.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration is courteously requested. If there are any remaining issues which can be expedited by a telephone conference, the examiner is courteously invited to telephone counsel at the number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

James E. Ruland, Reg. No. 37,432
Attorney for Applicants

Richard J. Traverso, Reg. No. 30,595
Representative Capacity

PLEASE SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

**Douglas S. Foote, Esq.
NCR Corporation
Law Department ECD-2
101 West Schantz Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45479-0001**

Attorney Docket No.: 9240 (NCRCO-95X)

Date: OCTOBER 27, 2002

K:\ncrco\95x\Reply to 9-4-03 OA.doc